

REMARKS

**I. Summary of Office Action**

Claims 1-29 are pending.

Claims 1-4, 8-11, 13-19, 23-26 and 28-29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Young et al U.S. Patent No. 5,532,754 ("Young") in view of Miller et al U.S. Patent No. 5,585,866 ("Miller").

Claims 5-7, 12, 20-22 and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Young in view of Miller and further in view of Lawler et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,805,763 ("Lawler").

**II. Summary of Applicants' Reply**

Applicants have amended independent claims 1 and 15 to more particularly define the claimed invention.

Applicants' claim amendments do not introduce any new matter and are fully supported by the originally filed specification (see, for example, p. 25, ll. 12-28, and FIGS. 18 and 19).

Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejections.

**III. The § 103(a) Rejection over Young in view of Miller**

The Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 8-11, 13-19, 23-26 and 28-29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Young in view of Miller. Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejection.

Applicants' claimed invention, as recited in independent claims 1 and 15, is directed to a method and system for displaying television program listings on a screen. The television program listings are displayed as a grid of two-dimensional cells, where the channels are displayed in a first dimension of the grid and time is displayed in the second dimension of the grid. An action control glyph is "simultaneously display[ed] with the program listings" in a second area of the screen (independent claims 1 and 15, emphasis added). A cell corresponding to one of the channels may be selected and the action control glyph may be activated by a user. In response to the activation of the action control glyph, the method and system rotate the grid of two-dimensional cells so that the one of the displayed plurality of channels is displayed in the second dimension and time is displayed in the first dimension (independent claims 1 and 15). Thus, applicants' claimed approach provides a convenient feature whereby the user can display listings for a specific channel without having to leave the grid.

The Examiner implicitly acknowledges the novelty of applicants' claimed invention over Young in the Office Action at p. 3, and acknowledges that Young does not disclose applicant's claimed action control glyph. To fill this gap, the Examiner looks to Miller and expresses the view that Miller in view of Young renders applicant's claims obvious. In particular, the Examiner contends that a user's activation of triangular icon 65c (FIG. 6) rotates a program listings grid as claimed by applicants (Office Action, p. 3, ¶ 3). Applicants respectfully disagree.

A user's selection of Miller's triangular icon 65c does not rotate a grid -- or any display for that matter -- as recited in applicants claims. This is clear from the fact that the channel listings mode display of FIG. 20 follows the display of the menu of FIG. 6, the display on which icon 65c is presented, and that the two have virtually nothing in common: the menu is not a listings grid. Moreover, applicants respectfully submit that to the extent that the Examiner contends the channel listings mode is a rotated view of the grid of FIG. 18 accessed via icon 65c of FIG. 6, the Examiner to be consistent must also consider the channel listings mode to be a rotated version of other screens from which the user may have entered the menu -- clearly an

incorrect view if it were had. Thus, the Examiner has not made a *prima facie* case of obviousness because combining Young and Miller does not result in a combination having an action control glyph "simultaneously display[ed] with the program listings," as recited in claims 1 and 15 (MPEP § 2142).

For at least the foregoing reasons, independent claims 1 and 15 are allowable over Young and Miller, whether taken alone or in combination. Claims 2-4, 8-11, 13-14, 16-19, 23-26 and 28-29, which depend from respective independent claims 1 and 15, are also allowable over Young and Miller for at least the reasons that independent claims 1 and 15 are allowable over Young and Miller. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request the rejection of claims 1-4, 8-11, 13-19, 23-26 and 28-29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

IV. The § 103(a) Rejection over Young in view of Miller and further in view of Lawler

The Examiner rejected claims 5-7, 12, 20-22 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Young in view of Miller and further in view of Lawler. Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejection.

Applicants' dependent claims 5-7, 12, 20-22 and 27 depend from allowable independent claims 1 and 15. Accordingly, dependent claims 5-7, 12, 20-22 and 27 are

patentable over Young in view of Miller and further in view of Lawler for at least the reasons that independent claims 1 and 15 are allowable over Young in view of Miller. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request the rejection of claims 5-7, 12, 20-22 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner's rejection is therefore both moot and overcome, and respectfully request the rejection of claims 5-7, 12, 20-22 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

V. Conclusion

For at least the foregoing reasons, applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-29 are allowable. Therefore, this application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, prompt reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Richard M. Feustel, Jr.  
Reg. No. 46,698  
Attorney for Applicants  
Fish & Neave IP Group  
Ropes & Gray LLP  
Customer No. 1473  
1251 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, New York 10020-1105  
Tel.: (212) 596-9000  
Fax: (212) 596-9090